DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 112 CE 050 388

AUTHOR Holian, Barbara L.
TITLE A Community Assessment of Functional Literacy.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 93p.; Master's Thesis, San Jose State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Adult Programs; Attitude Change; *Community Attitudes; Community Surveys; Evaluation; *Functional Literacy; Hispanic Americans; *Literacy Education; Public Agencies; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *California (Salinas)

ABSTRACT

A community assessment for literacy action was conducted in Salinas, California. Service agencies were surveyed to assess literacy programs and materials. The agencies were asked questions regarding awareness of the illiteracy problem, knowledge of existing or retired programs, and agency commitment to support of a community-wide program. Research substantiated the hypothesis that Salinas agencies in contact with the functionally illiterate population were aware that a large number of people in the community had difficulty with the English language. The agencies considered this difficulty an Hispanic problem and an individual responsibility. The agencies were aware of the programs of the Adult School of the Salinas Union High School District and considered them adequate. They were not directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy and did not intend to be. Their lack of support had inhibited literacy efforts in the community. Few agencies referred individuals to Adult School programs. Almost three-fourths of the agencies identified the problem as a concern mainly in the realm of employment; therefore, they did nothing about it. A radical change in community attitude was seen as requiring dramatic media coverage as well as workshop participation. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296112

A COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Plan B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

---

by

Barbara L. Holian

August 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B Holian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 050 388

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Approved by the Department of Secondary Education

_____

_____

Approved by the School of Education Graduate Office

_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of this study, I have been in contact with many helpful individuals, all of whom I cannot possibly acknowledge by name. I would like to thank Esta Lee Albright, Karen Shender, Brenda Gray, Mary Lou Strathmeyer, and Sharon Miller. I was fortunate to exchange ideas with Lotte and Alan Marcus on two valuable days, for which I am ever grateful. I also want to thank all Salinas agencies who participated in this study for giving generously of their time and knowledge. I especially want to express appreciation to those who demonstrated genuine concern by giving further references and offering insightful information, particularly the Monterey County District Attorney, William D. Curtis.

I am grateful to Dr. Alice Scofield, without whom this project would not have been conceived, for her constancy in encouragement and inspiration.

Finally, I want to give special thanks to Miguel Mejia for his unfailing care and support throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 2

Hypothesis 3

Significance of the Problem 4

Limitations 5

Assumptions 5

Definitions 5

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 8

History of Functional Literacy 8

Program Designs for Functional Illiterates 10

Assessment of Functional Illiterates 14

Suggestions for Further Research 17

3. METHOD AND MATERIALS 19

Data Needed 19

Sources of Data 20

Tools and Techniques 20

The Questionnaire 22

4. ANALYSIS OF DATA 25

Introduction 25

Page

Explanation of Column Headings for Table I 28

Awareness of the Problem, Tables II-VII 35

Knowledge of Programs, Tables VIII-XI 43

Willingness to Support, Tables XII-XIII 47

Evaluation of Present Situation, Table XIV 50

Summary 54

5. DISCUSSION 55

Description of the Procedure 55

Principal Findings 57

Awareness of functional illiteracy in Salinas 57

Knowledge of local literacy programs 59

Willingness to support a community-wide literacy effort 61

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 63

Restatement of the Problem 63

Conclusions 64

Recommendations for Further Study 65

BIBLIOGRAPHY 68

APPENDIXES 72

A. Comprehensive List of Agencies Contacted 73

B. Letter of Request for Interview 76

C. Return Response Postcard 77

D. Interview Questions 78

E. Questionnaire Response Sheet 81

F. 1970 Map of Salinas Census Tracts with Location of Adult School Classes 82

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	AGENCIES CONTACTED FOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	27
II.	DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY BY AREAS OF COMPETENCY	29
III.	DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY BY AREAS OF GENERAL COMMUNICATION	30
IV.	DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY RELATIVE TO JOB DEMANDS	31
V.	CHARACTERISTIC BEHAVIORS OF DISADVANTAGED ADULTS AS OBSERVED BY LOCAL AGENCIES	32
VI.	EMPLOYEES' OR SERVICED PERSONS' DIFFICULTIES WITH THE WRITTEN WORD AS OBSERVED BY LOCAL AGENCIES	33
VII.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF FUNCTIONAL ILLITERACY TO BE A PROBLEM IN SALINAS	34
VIII.	AGENCY KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS PRESENTLY AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC	38
IX.	AGENCY KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PRESENT OR RETIRED LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS	39
X.	CURRENT AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN LITERACY ACTION	41
XI.	WHAT AGENCIES THINK SHOULD BE DONE FOR FUNCTIONAL ILLITERATES IN SALINAS	42
XII.	IN WHAT AREAS AGENCIES WOULD BE WILLING TO OFFER FOUNDATIONAL SUPPORT	45
XIII.	IN WHAT AREAS AGENCIES WOULD BE WILLING TO OFFER OUTREACH ASSISTANCE	46
XIV.	EVALUATION OF LOCAL LITERACY ACTION INADEQUACY	49
XV.	EFFECTIVE INFORMATION CHANNELS FOR PROGRAM OUTREACH	51

Table Page

XVI. DEFINITION OR PERCEPTION ALTERATION FOR AGENCIES DURING INTERVIEW 52

XVII. CENSORSHIP OF AGENCY RESPONSES 53

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of literacy levels seems to have developed during World War II in specialist circles. Servicemen were labeled illiterate if they could not read and follow written instructions. At that time, the United States Bureau of the Census identified the functionally illiterate as one who had not completed five years of schooling or who could not read and write. Though the definition evolved over the next thirty-five years, the use of schooling as a determining factor continued to reappear. The definition also continued to include a direct relationship to the individual's work situation rather than to a condition affecting his whole human growth. Functional illiteracy has, therefore, become the label for those members of society who, for one reason or another, are not equipped to deal adequately with the demands of growing technology in a practical sense.

Assessment of functional literacy depends on its definition. For some, it is best determined by ability to perform a given task. For others, it is best determined by ability to manage one's behavior in any social context. Language is, indeed, the decoding device of a society, and its mastery determines strength or weakness in coping within that society.

Each society sets the standards of success for its citizens. In the United States, the social structure is very closely linked to the

economic structure. Opportunities for advancement are allowed primarily through the educational system which is, by law, affordable for all. But it, too, operates by persons who generally accept and perpetuate the societal standards, leaving as victims of the system those whom we now label functional illiterates. Standards and assessment of adequacy by those standards are educational matters to be addressed by educators. They result in programs and materials to meet their particular needs. An examination of the societal attitudes toward expectations for and evaluation of functional illiteracy on a local level is the subject of this research.

Statement of the Problem

Initially, the intention was to assess literacy programs and materials in Salinas through a survey of participants, veterans, and instructors. The process was begun by contacting education agencies for leads as to their literacy program coordinators.

During that process, misinformation coupled with observable frustration was evident. There had been a variety of programs. A handful of retired teachers taught the Laubach method (1977-1980) to individuals referred to them by word of mouth, until it became apparent that Hartnell students were doing the same and receiving college credit; the teachers stopped services. Hartnell students have not been active since that time. The Volunteer Bureau was surprised Sunrise House no longer offered literacy classes. Sunrise House was surprised the Volunteer Bureau no longer offered services. Monterey County Council thought literacy classes were offered on a county level; they are not. Ft. Ord Educational Center, which works with illiterate soldiers, many of whom

are Salinas residents, was not prepared to comment when contacted.

The program coordinator of Adult Basic Education (ABE) through the Adult School of the Salinas Union High School District (SUHSD) has two or three students of the one hundred enrolled who are English speaking, American-born and functionally illiterate. Non-native speakers enroll in Adult School ESL classes (4,024 in 1981-1982) until reaching the fifth grade level in listening skills, at which time they are promoted to the ABE program; few make the transition. These two are the only programs available to the general public.

In a city the size of Salinas (85,000) whose population is 39.68 percent Hispanic and includes an increasing number of refugees as well as a settling migrant population that speaks little or no English, more community effort for literacy education might be expected. By APL standards of assessment, between two and twelve percent of the population is having serious difficulty coping with language. Approximately five percent are enrolled in Adult School ESL and Citizenship classes; one tenth of one percent are enrolled in Adult School ABE classes.

Hypothesis

Salinas agencies who have contact with the functionally illiterate population are aware that a large number of people in the community have difficulty with the English language. The agencies consider this difficulty an Hispanic problem and an individual responsibility. These same agencies are generally aware of the programs through Adult School and consider them adequate. They are not directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy, nor do they intend to be. Their lack of support has inhibited literacy efforts in the community.

Significance of the Problem

No other community assessment for literacy action is known to have been attempted in Salinas. Programs have sprung up over the years; many were very effective albeit short-lived. Persons contacted about those programs indicate that community resistance attributed to their termination. There seems to be a feeling that those in positions of management are uneasy about the liberation that education affords. Efforts toward functional literacy were extinguished by promises of continuance by other means and by withdrawing support of services. This assessment may have led to conclusions regarding the acceptability and unacceptability of further pursuits.

Community life is changing for Salinas. It used to be that Hispanic laborers would migrate seasonally into and out of the valley. Educators in public schools felt the effect in classrooms with fluctuating enrollment, but workers generally kept to themselves in camps and isolated neighborhoods. That condition is changing, with more and more migrants settling down to stay and seek stability.

In addition, a large influx of Asians is changing the composition of the community. Whites comprise 50.48 percent of the Salinas population; non-Whites comprise 49.52 percent of the Salinas population, and that figure is expected to surpass the former by 1990. If we are to maintain a homogeneous democracy and achieve a sense of community, of unity, the issue of functional literacy is a core concern. Recognizing that the pressure of community groups notably affects any efforts toward that end, an assessment of present positions seems appropriate.

Limitations

Due to the limitations stated herein, this study is, in fact, incomplete.

1) Only forty-two of one hundred eighteen contacted service agencies in the area were able to give survey data within the time allotment.
2) Only those individuals sixteen years and older who are no longer being schooled in the traditional way are considered.
3) No other similar studies could be found by the researcher for comparison or modeling.
4) Functional illiteracy is termed so with respect to the English language only. Those who are functionally literate in another language but not in English are, for the purpose of this study, functionally illiterate.

Assumptions

I am assuming that there is a functionally illiterate population in Salinas. I am assuming that acknowledged methods for identifying the functionally illiterate also apply to the Salinas population. I am assuming that community agency responses accurately reflect their perception of the situation in Salinas. I am assuming that the accurate identification and rehabilitation of functionally illiterate adults will improve the overall quality of life in the community.

Definitions

adult - A person sixteen years or older is considered an adult.

Adult Education programs - An Adult Education program is any course or assistance offered through a local school system designed to provide local residents with experience necessary in acquiring job training,

citizenship, a high school diploma, or literacy skills.

Adult Performance Level (APL) areas of functional competency (University of Texas 1975):

consumer economics - This area concerns the management of a family economy and awareness of sound purchasing principles.

occupational knowledge - This area concerns a level of competency which will enable adults to secure employment in accordance with their individual needs and interests.

health - This area concerns the development of good mental and physical health for the individual and his family.

community resources - This area concerns an understanding of community resources, including transportation systems, utilized by individuals in society in order to obtain a satisfactory mode of living.

government and law - This area concerns an understanding of society through government and law and awareness of governmental function, agencies, and regulations which define individual rights and obligations.

educationally disadvantaged adult - An educationally disadvantaged adult is one who is not enrolled in school and who has not completed secondary education.

functional literacy - A person is functionally literate when he has command of language skills that permit him to receive, process, and respond to information communicated in all social contexts encountered on a daily basis.

literacy - A person is considered literate when he has acquired the language skills necessary to participate fully in civic life, under-

stand at greater depths his surrounding world, and explore the treasures of basic human culture.

literacy programs - Literacy programs are those designed to educate educationally disadvantaged adults to the level of functional literacy, be that on a one-to-one basis or in a classroom/group situation.

Salinas agencies as grouped for this study's discussion:

Cultural agencies - Cultural agencies are those who provide opportunities for communication of the fine arts and human achievements.

Health/Education agencies - Health and education agencies were combined on the basis of their shared commitment to help persons regain or renew physical, mental, and emotional health through medical care or enrichment and rehabilitation programs.

Information agencies - Information agencies are those which are responsible for disseminating information through advertising, literature, and news.

Legal agencies - Legal agencies include all those who direct the application of legal regulations in the community.

Religious agencies - Religious agencies are those of any faith or denomination which promote spiritual development in individuals.

Social/Welfare agencies - Social and welfare agencies were combined on the basis of their shared commitment to community life involvement, in assisting community members to interact for enrichment of the community, in assimilating community members into the mainstream of community life, and in aiding those community members who struggle in meeting their basic survival needs.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature as it relates to the issues of this study. The review, then, provides an examination of the history of functional literacy, the areas of investigation and difficulties encountered by the experts, and the procedures and instruments employed by program participants. The only literature relating directly to community assessment of functional illiterates is found in Couvert's model for assessing the chances for success of a community literacy program (Couvert 1979). That information will be addressed in conjunction with other comments on said assessment methods later in this chapter. This review will focus on definitions of terms, program designs, and assessment methodologies.

History of Functional Literacy

In review of the history of functional literacy, the author notes a political backdrop from as early as 1882.

> The Immigration Restriction League . . . proposed the use of literacy tests to restrict immigration in the hope that such tests would eliminate the migration of persons from eastern and southern parts of Europe (Cook pp. 2-3).

That theme prevails throughout the development of the concept of literacy as presented by researchers. Hunter and Harman cite sociologist Randall Collins' observations of nineteenth century America:

> Each time competing ethnic minorities reached the educational levels they had been told would lead to economic success and prestige, the

> game rules were changed. The dominant groups in society, in this case the white middle and upper classes, define job requirements in terms of their own achievements and then impose these as standards for the society (Hunter and Harman p. 19).

Cook and Levine both agree that situation has not changed through the years of human development.

> . . . as long as there are people credited with special or superior literacy skills, the least competent will remain vulnerable to discrimination. Altering the official benchmark of functionality cannot affect this situation (Levine p. 260).

The definition of functional literacy has undergone many changes since those early days in 1882. More and more information is being accumulated, documented, and required for successful living. With the advent of competencies, it is being addressed in terms of measurable behaviors. However, many published educators continue to define functional literacy in terms of mental processes or creative problem solving.

> . . . the ability to exhibit all of the behaviors a person needs in order to respond appropriately to all possible reading tasks (Bormuth p. 72).

> . . . a possession of those literary skills needed to successfully perform some reading task imposed by an external agent between a reader and a goal the reader wishes to obtain (Levine p. 256).

> . . . [the ability] to "read the world" as well as read the word (Drennan p. 377).

> . . . to think conceptually, to structure experience, to look through wider and more diverse perspectives at the lived world (Greene p. 5).

> . . . literacy ought to be conceived as an opening, a becoming, never a fixed end (Ibid. p. 2).

Functional illiteracy, on the other hand, has been defined in quite definite terms. It is easier to determine for census reporting. In 1882, illiterates were those who had not learned to write in any language. By 1900, the definition included the inability to also <u>read</u> in any language as well as an age factor of ten years and older. By

1924, the definition read, "one who has not mastered the art of reading and writing sufficiently to use it in daily life." In 1930, the National Education Association attempted a basis of literacy at the sixth grade level, but it was not until 1947 that the census definition included completion of five years of elementary school. In 1950, only the age factor changed to persons fourteen years and older. In 1959, the definition changed to include "or English" and that measured by the ability to read and write a simple message (Cook pp. 3-79; Levine pp. 250-3, 259-60). The next stage in this history occurred when the "Adult Education Act of 1969 . . . defined an adult as a person over sixteen and . . . extended the opportunities to those with less than a twelfth grade education" (Cook p. 106).

In other words, by utilizing grade levels in assessment of literacy, those concerned citizens could say what it was not but not definitively what it was. The 1970's introduced functional literacy in terms of positive competencies in job skills-related and life skills-related contexts. All-in-all, researchers do not agree with each other on definition. On the one hand, Lerner states that "low-level reading comprehension [is] referred to as functional literacy" (Lerner p. 1058). On the other, Levine believes that the omission of writing from conceptions and operationalization constitutes a serious disservice to the learner albeit an understandable position politically (Levine p. 262).

Program Designs for Functional Illiterates

United States literacy program designs tend to fall into two categories: one designed to address intellectual growth and one designed to address social competency. Those who educate for intellectual growth

see learning as action rather than behavior and affiliate with literacy programs. Those who educate for social competency, see learning opportunities as secondary to goals or outcomes and affiliate with competency-based programs. This does not mean that the two do not intersect, but it does mean that their basic approaches are very different.

The literature reveals that literacy programs include adult basic education, Laubach, Literacy Volunteers of America, Right to Read, prison education programs, and library programs. These are concerned with the development or increase of conventional literacy skills (Hunter and Harman pp. 61-75). Proponents generally do not agree that there is a direct relationship between literacy and employment, although Levine does argue that literates are chosen by employers even of the unskilled labor force for qualities which are developed by literates: discipline, cooperation, and a long-staying tendency (Levine p. 258). Literacy educators "focus upon both awareness and use of a repertoire of strategies" in order to make the student search for internal rather than external support/sources (Gambrell pp. 220-1).

With regard to bilingual education for adults, only two references were available in terms of its demands for effectiveness. Both agree in substance, in literacy education for personal and political freedom from oppression and in the importance of association with native cultural experiences. Paulo Freire's approach, developed in Brazil, is one of conscientization as an integral part of literacy education. Vocabulary and writings are drawn from the common cultural experiences to expand the learner's awareness and bring him ultimately into freedom (Freire 1970). Martinez indicates concurrence. "Literacy has no positive significance for Hispano-Americans unless it deals with their his-

tory, their present reality, and their human potential" (Martinez p. 282).

The literature reveals that competency-based education includes military programs, labor union seminars, programs, and courses, cultural and ethnic organizations' use of tools and resources in the community, and general community-based programs (Hunter and Harman pp. 75-90). The Adult Performance Level (APL) battery is in widespread use in these programs. In whatever form, "Competency-Based Adult Education is a performance-based process leading to demonstrated mastery of basic and life skills necessary for the individual to function proficiently in society" (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare p. 1). It is specifically directed toward life circumstances of the learner. It "assumes that every adult student wishes to learn and will learn, provided he is in a supportive learning setting and is learning relevant information that will enhance his own life" (Ulmer p. 56). It implies that "a person is functionally competent only to the extent that he or she can meet the requirements which are extant at a given point of time" (University of Texas p. 2), which requires continual reevaluation and re-education. The APL program attempts to do away with the question of literacy. It addresses the notion of minimum functional competencies. On a continuum, in other words, literacy is not the ultimate goal; meeting prescribed competencies is.

Researchers agree that adult education candidates may include school dropouts, functionally illiterate high school graduates, immigrant groups, migrant workers, and youth and adult offenders in correctional institutions. These candidates are categorized for purposes of instructional approach and evaluation by the nature of their learning obstacles. The Appalachian Adult Education Center considers accessibility and family

responsibilities the key determining factors (Hunter and Harman p. 55). Cook considers attitude the chief determining factor.

> Attitude, then, is the hidden variable of the literacy problem. At times it is an almost imperceptible factor and yet it is ever present. It is this factor which will determine the ultimate success or failure of literacy programs, for there is no program nor legislation that can force a person to learn if he does not want to learn. Attitude is the very core of the problem and the factor which is virtually impossible for educators to control (Cook p. 122).

Research suggests that "poverty and the power structures of society are more responsible for low levels of literacy than the reverse" (Hunter and Harman p. 9). Whatever the elements of cause-effect conditioning, "schools, adult education programs, and the total system of formal and nonformal education for all ages reflect our society's vision of itself and its goals" (Ibid. p. 3).

Obstacles other than those of an internal nature brought on by the learner himself or those of an external nature imposed on the learner by societal structures, include those of a pedagogical nature: the lack of models in literacy education (Drennan p. 384), its considered extension of the elementary and secondary public education program (Ibid. p. 383), and misunderstanding of its responsibility by the public as well as by those involved in literacy programs.

> Lack of coordination between the various efforts, overlap, and lack of ongoing systematic planning and evaluation combine to hamper adult basic education activities around the country (Hunter and Harman p. 236).

In addition, McGovern refers to federal assistance amounting to one dollar for each educationally disadvantaged adult reaching only 1 to 2 percent of those in need. Gambrell says (p. 215) less than 1 percent of federal funding ends up in adult education programs, and Hunter and Harman (p. 8) cite that fewer than two million adults are enrolled in

programs designed to meet the needs of sixty million. In closing this section, the author recognizes O'Neil who suggests that the very programs themselves may pose a threat or obstacle to liberating literacy.

> Proper literacy should extend a man's control over his life and environment and allow him to continue to deal rationally and in words with his life and decision. Improperly it reduces and destroys his control. He is deluded by the veneer of control he has been granted, not minding that he has lost everything else (O'Neil p. 263).

Assessment of Functional Illiterates

Researchers generally agree on ball park figures of between fifty-four and sixty-four million people nationwide who are functionally illiterate. That translates into between 24 and 29 percent of the United States population. Of those who enroll in adult education classes, certain characteristics have become evident to assessors, namely, shared difficulty with regard to education, income, and/or employment. This information is public knowledge, within cities even by tract, due to census acquisition.

Level of education as an assessment tool has changed radically over the years, and the 1978 APL study indicates that those who have not completed high school may qualify for closer scrutiny. Of those with six or seven years of schooling, 50 percent were considered illiterate. Of those with high school education, 50 percent were considered proficient (University of Texas p. 7).

> While all who lack high school diplomas are not functionally illiterate by any means, the evidence is strong that the bulk of those who are functionally illiterate are found among persons who fail to graduate from high school (Hunter and Harman p. 23).

Family income below $10,000 annually, according to the 1978 APL study, raises suspicions of functional illiteracy. Of those in that range, 20 to 40 percent were considered illiterate, while 52 percent of

those with $10,000-$14,999 were considered proficient (Ibid.). The 1980 Gallini study sets limits according to observations of education and income combined: Group A, $5,000 or less annually, eight years or less education; Group B, $5,000-$14,000 annual income, nine to eleven years education; Group C, over $14,000 annual income, twelve or more years education. The discrepancy may be due to the economic conditions of the years in which the studies were conducted. Barbara Bush notes in 1983 that "the proportion of persons with fewer than six grades of school on public assistance is more than double that among those with 9-11 years of school" (Bush p. 14).

Research tends to agree that job status is another accurate assessment tool. Again, the APL study of 1978 draws a line of demarcation between the unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and the clerical, profession/managerial positions. According to those findings, 24 percent of skilled to 30 percent of unskilled workers were considered illiterate, while 54 percent of clerical to 61 percent of profession/managerial workers were considered proficient.

> Viewed in terms of social institutions and programs, illiteracy runs hand in hand with dependency and deprivation. Seventy-five percent of the unemployed have inadequate reading and writing skills; so do eighty-five percent of the juveniles brought before the courts, ninety percent of AFDC mothers, and half or more of all prison inmates (Williams p. 12-3).

Experts agree that social disadvantages and deprivation directly relate to the condition of functional illiteracy, more and more as we move into complex technology.

Other interesting factors noted by the APL study include age: more illiteracy in citizens fifty years or older; ethnicity: illiteracy in Whites, 16 percent, in Blacks, 44 percent, and in those with Spanish

surnames, 56 percent; and area of the country: more illiteracy per capita in the South.

Characteristic behaviors exhibited by functional illiterates also arouse the attention of assessors to possible victims. The functional illiterate does not know of channels which exist to meet his needs, except through "an informal information network that is deficient in the information that is ordinarily available to the rest of society" (Hunter and Harman p. 54). He watches many hours of television and rarely reads; he never reads a book, which is why Tomasson relied so heavily upon that criteria in assessing the conditions in Iceland, 1975 (Atkinson p. 26). From Kozol's experiences with these individuals, he details the "defensive strategies . . . a complicated series of deceptions, obviations, and evasions. An entire style of 'lying low' and 'watching out for traps' comes to be a way of life" (Kozol p. 8). The functional illiterate does not see his problems as informational needs. "The person who can barely read and compute is the one who does not tend to voluntarily enter or to stay in our programs" (Fischer p. 28). He is less open to change and less supportive of democratic values and political parties than his counterpart (Levine p. 257). Too, the demonstrated hopelessness is exacerbated by his familial background; "the single best predictor of how a student will perform on academic tasks is the social class of his parents" (Atkinson p. 24).

A key assessment tool, which varies greatly across the country, is the societal milieu itself. The society determines the acceptable standards of living, knowledge, attitudes, and practices for its locale. Couvert acknowledges that those who come in contact with functional illiterates through community agencies are aware of their difficulties

and their needs. He suggests a commonality of those observable behaviors: lack of intellectual abilities, lack of professional skills, lack of conscientiousness, neglect of safety regulations, lack of know how, difficulties or hostility with regard to new techniques or products, and/or anti-progressive attitudes and behavior (Couvert p. 69). Kozol implies that a society may not want change, when he writes about "a social structure which perceives [the illiterate] as expendable, socially and economically" (Kozol p. 7) and wishes it to remain so. The point of departure, therefore, is the way people operationalize and assess functional literacy, and that governed by the society in which persons function.

Suggestions for Further Research

The author, at this point, refers to a study by Sticht, maybe the only one done of its kind, which found "low correlations between reading scores and practical on-the-job performance tests, and essentially no relationship between these measures and supervisors' ratings of individuals performing at a given job" (Kirsch p. 491). Certainly more studies are required to substantiate the value of increased literacy in terms of job-related tasks in order to relate a functional illiterate's goal to the education offered him, if the case for literacy programs is to gather solid support.

The author also appreciates the comments given by Postman which challenge the motivation for such strong emphasis on word literacy and question whether our concern in this highly technological age demands a multi-media literacy. Particularly, with the advent of the computer, standards of literacy must not shy from societal changes but embrace the opportunities for broadening perceptions of the lived world and correlate

its studies with regard to the new demands.

Through the review of related literature, two other questions emerged: 1) Is there a relationship between lack of coordination among various literacy efforts and the lack of funding/support by federal, state, and local agencies? and 2) In those areas where a high rate of illiteracy is suspected, how much a contributing factor is societal expectations or lack of them?

Chapter 3

METHOD AND MATERIALS

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the procedure followed in gathering data to disprove or substantiate the hypothesis as stated here:

> Salinas agencies who have contact with the functionally illiterate population are aware that a large number of people in the community have difficulty with the English language. The agencies consider this difficulty an Hispanic problem and an individual responsibility. These same agencies are generally aware of the programs through Adult School and consider them adequate. They are not directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy, nor do they intend to be. Their lack of support has inhibited literacy efforts in the community.

The hypothesis involves three areas, therefore--awareness of the problem, knowledge of the programs, and willingness to support literacy efforts--which the procedure for gathering data addresses.

Data Needed

The data gathered focuses on three areas of inquiry in order to give an overview of agency perceptions. The first area is that of definition. Agencies were given the freedom to define functional literacy for themselves to initiate discussion. The second area, after having assigned a goal, is the assessment of programs currently in operation. Here, again, objective statistics were offered only for the purpose of aiding the agencies in determining the adequacy of those programs. The third area involves the discovery of how agencies are involved in literacy education and how they would be willing to support a community-wide literacy effort.

Preliminary research involved an examination of national and international studies conducted by others for the purpose of assessing the scope of the problem. That information was followed by the examination of demographic data for Salinas, relating it to the other findings. Also, individuals who had knowledge of past and present programs were contacted. Finally, data collected through the personal interview method yielded the findings of this research described in chapter four.

Sources of Data

Statistics for estimating the number of functional illiterates in Salinas were gathered based on assessment methods used by others. Documents in the Salinas Public Library concerning the community demographics were consulted: Answers to the Most Commonly Asked Questions About Population, Housing, and Employment in Salinas, 1983; Market Profile Analysis, Salinas, Seaside, Monterey, CA, SMSA, 1982; and the most recent United States Bureau of the Census data available on the area population (1976-1982).

The Monterey County Profile was consulted for a compilation of agencies active in Salinas who would possibly come in contact with functional illiterates. That resulted in a list of approximately 118 agencies (see Appendix A). The researcher met with each agency representative for a thirty-minute interview in his office and as close to his preference of time as possible. These interviews were conducted within a three week period beginning March 21, and ending April 8, 1983.

Tools and Techniques

A Xeroxed letter with individually typed return address was sent

to each agency at the address given in the Profile, introducing the researcher and the research project. A thirty-minute interview was requested at the convenience of the representative available, and appreciation was expressed for his assistance (see Appendix B). Enclosed in each envelope, a self-addressed stamped postcard listed preferential dates and times to be circled by the respondent as well as space for the respondent's name and phone number for interview confirmation (see Appendix C).

As the response cards filtered back, a schedule was arranged for interviews, confirmed as projected by phone. The first and third weeks of the schedule, interviews were conducted every half-hour from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M. The second week being Easter break for the public schools afforded the researcher more flexibility in meeting at any time during the day hours. The schedule included slots for ninety-two interviews.

Meanwhile, a questionnaire was developed to be used in the interviews, addressing the concerns posed by the hypothesis. Two individuals with research experience examined the questionnaire and suggested changes as reflected in the final form (see Appendix D).

A response sheet for recording responses was typed and enough copies Xeroxed for interviews conducted. This response sheet not only identified the agency, the representative, and the date and time, but also allowed space for identifying the purpose of the agency, which was used in identifying the various agencies contacted by type when tabulating their responses (see Appendix E).

Data collected from the interviews was tabulated in two ways: 1) by agency type consensus, and 2) by combined agency consensus.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the process of interviewing agency members was designed to discover the answers to three basic questions: 1) What is your awareness of the problem?, 2) What is your knowledge of existing or retired programs?, and 3) What is your agency's commitment to support of a community-wide program? As the interview progressed, the interviewer divulged more information found in preparatory research. Therefore, once the interviewee had begun to identify for himself the communication skills necessary for coping within the community, his being presented with the reality of facts and figures enabled him to more thoughtfully evaluate the problems and possibilities from his perspective. The depth of his responses depended entirely on his willingness to consider the situation.

The process can be described on a step-by-step, question-by-question basis. Questions One, Two, Three, Four, and Ten address the person's awareness of the problem. Questions Five, Six, Seven, and Eight address the person's knowledge of programs. Questions Nine and Twelve address the person's willingness to support a community-wide program. Question Thirteen addresses the person's evaluation of the present situation. Questions Eleven, Fourteen, and Fifteen are strictly informational. The interviewer specifically asked each interviewee to respond to the questionnaire on behalf of his agency.

Question One asks the interviewee to identify the skills he considers necessary to adequately function with language.

Question Two asks if that definition changes with one's work environment. It intends to discover if the interviewee favors literacy education or competency-based education.

Question Three, based on information from Couvert (1979), asks the interviewee to take a look at related areas of observable behavior, indicating that functional illiterates tend to conceal their handicap while at the same time demonstrating certain characteristic behaviors.

Question Four asks the interviewee to identify those individuals in employ or service who demonstrate difficulty in reading, writing, or using picture clues to understand.

Question Five asks the interviewee of what educational resources he knows in the area for functional illiterates. This question requiring a single answer is followed by Question Six which asks the interviewee if he knows of any other programs available, either existing or retired.

Question Seven asks what his agency is doing to promote literacy skills.

Question Eight asks what he thinks should be done. Responses to this question naturally fall into three areas of responsibility: 1) the individual, 2) the programs, and/or 3) the support systems.

Question Nine presents general findings of successful programs as they relate to community enrichment. It then asks if the interviewee's agency will be willing to foundationally support a city-wide effort on various levels through funding, supplying volunteers, or participating in a community literacy commission.

Question Ten presents researched percentage figures from census and profile data based on the United States Census Bureau definition and asks if the interviewee thinks those figures represent a literacy problem for Salinas.

Question Eleven asks what informational network seems appropriate for outreach into the community.

Question Twelve asks if the interviewee's agency will be willing to support a city-wide program through any of those informational channels.

Question Thirteen presents the interviewee with the facts of programs in operation (basically through the SUHSD Adult School) and of programs no longer in operation (basically Behavioral Sciences Institute, English on Wheels, Hartnell College tutors, Laubach with retired teachers in Salinas, Sunrise House, and the Volunteer Bureau) and relays a remark made by the coordinator of Adult Basic Education that maybe two or three English-speaking functional illiterates are enrolled in her program. It then asks the interviewee why he thinks so little is being accomplished in the city.

Question Fourteen asks if his definition or perception of functional literacy has altered during the interview.

Question Fifteen asks if the interviewee wants anything he has said kept from publication.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter is a presentation of data gathered from interviews with Salinas community agencies. In Tables I-XVII, the agency types and the number of representatives for each are consistently listed along the left margin. The columns designed to tabulate responses are headed by appropriate terms for discussion. Table I presents the agencies contacted and their responses to the request for participation.

Data included in Tables II-XVII tabulate responses to interview questions which are compared in one of two ways. Questions for which agencies are limited to one response per column are tabulated and compared by the number of agencies responding. The percentage figures across the charts indicate the percentage of responding agencies of that type. The percentage figures by columns indicate the percentage of all responding agencies, 100 percent being the total of agencies responding as charted. Questions for which agencies are not limited in responses are tabulated to include all given responses. These are compared by the number of responses by agency type, across the charts in percentage figures. They are also compared by the number of responses by all agencies as ordered by columns, 100 percent being the total of responses by agency type and by agency composite.

Tables correspond to questions as indicated in the brief analysis following each section. Tables II-VII compile responses regarding agency awareness of the problem. Tables VIII-XI compile responses regarding agency knowledge of local programs. Tables XII-XIII compile responses regarding agency willingness to support a community-wide literacy effort. Table XIV compiles responses regarding agency evaluation of the present situation. Tables XV-XVII correspond to informational Questions Eleven, Fourteen, and Fifteen, and are included for reference only.

TABLE I

AGENCIES CONTACTED FOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Group	Total	Returned	Refused	Not applicable	Unable to make connection	Inter-viewed	Did not reply
Cultural	5	1	-	-	1	3	-
Informational	5	1	-	1	1	1	1
Health/Education	27	6	2	1	2	12	4
Legal	19	1	4	2	3	5	4
Religious	31	3	2	-	2	10	14
Social/Welfare	31	2	1	-	1	11	16
Totals	118	14	9	4	10	42	39
Percentages	100%	12%	8%	3%	8%	36%	33%

Explanation of Column Headings

for Table I

Total: Total number of requests sent to agencies.

Returned: Letter requests returned to sender unopened.

Refused: Agencies who were contacted but would not allow for an interview for one reason or another.

Not applicable: Agencies whose service experience did not afford them contact with community members as was required to participate in this research.

Unable to make connection: Agencies who, because of communication or scheduling complication, could not follow through with the interview.

Interviewed: Agencies interviewed for this study.

Did not reply: Agencies who received the letter request but did not return the self-addressed, stamped appointment postcard.

TABLE II

DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY
BY AREAS OF COMPETENCY

	Consumer Economics	Occupational Knowledge	Health	Community Resources	Government and Law	General Communication
Cultural 3	1 16.6					5 83.3
Informational 1						1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12		10 34.5			5 17.2	14 48.3
Legal 5	1 6.7	4 26.7			1 6.7	9 60.0
Religious 10	3 9.7	3 9.7			2 6.5	23 74.2
Social/Welfare 11		4 17.4		1 4.3	1 4.3	17 73.9
Total of Responses	5	21	0	1	9	69
Percentage of Responses	4.8%	20.0%	0.0%	1.0%	8.6%	65.7%
Percentage of Competency Responses	13.9%	58.3%	0.0%	2.8%	25.0%	

TABLE III

DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY
BY AREAS OF GENERAL COMMUNICATION

	Read	Write	Listen and Understand	Speak	Competency Level
Cultural 3	2 33.3	1 16.7			3 50.0
Informational 1					1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12	8 27.6	11 37.9	4 13.8	2 6.9	4 13.8
Legal 5	7 46.7	2 13.3	2 13.3	1 6.7	3 20.0
Religious 10	13 41.9	7 22.6	1 3.2	1 3.2	9 29.0
Social/Welfare 11	8 34.8	6 26.1	1 4.3	1 4.3	7 30.4
Total of Respondents	38	27	8	5	27
Percentage of Respondents	36.2%	25.7%	7.6%	4.8%	25.7%
Percentage of Communication Responses	48.7%	34.6%	10.3%	6.4%	

TABLE IV

DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL LITERACY
RELATIVE TO JOB DEMANDS

	Definition varies with the job	Definition does not vary with the job
Cultural 2	2 100.0	
Informational 1	1 100.0	
Health/Educ. 11	8 72.7	3 27.3
Legal 4	2 50.0	2 50.0
Religious 10	7 70.0	3 30.0
Social/Welfare 11	10 90.9	1 9.1
Total of Respondents	30	9
Percentage of Respondents	76.9%	23.0%

TABLE V

CHARACTERISTIC BEHAVIORS OF DISADVANTAGED ADULTS
AS OBSERVED BY LOCAL AGENCIES

	Lack intellectual ability		Lack professional skills		Lack conscientiousness		Neglect safety rules		Lack know how		Demonstrate difficulty or hostility to change		Demonstrate anti-progressive attitudes	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Cultural 3	1 33.3	2 66.7	2 66.7	1 33.3	1 33.3	2 66.7	1 33.3	1 33.3	1 33.3	2 66.7	1 33.3	2 66.7	1 33.3	2 66.7
Informational 1	1 100.0		1 100.0			1 100.0	1 100.0		1 100.0		1 100.0			1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12	8 66.7	4 33.3	10 83.3	2 16.7	7 58.3	4 33.3	9 75.0	2 16.7	6 50.0	4 33.3	11 91.7	1 8.3	10 83.3	2 16.7
Legal 5	3 60.0	1 20.0	3 60.0	2 40.0	2 40.0	2 40.0	2 40.0	3 60.0	3 60.0	1 20.0	3 60.0	1 20.0	3 60.0	1 20.0
Religious 10	9 90.0	1 10.0	10 100.0		6 60.0	4 40.0	6 60.0	2 20.0	9 90.0	1 10.0	6 60.0	4 40.0	9 90.0	1 10.0
Social/Welfare 11	7 63.6	4 36.4	9 81.8	2 18.2	10 90.9	1 9.1	6 54.5	2 18.2	10 90.9	1 9.1	9 81.8	1 9.1	8 72.7	1 9.1
Total of Respondents	29	12	35	7	26	14	25	10	30	9	31	9	31	8
Percentage of Respondents	70.7%	29.2%	83.3%	16.6%	65.0%	35.0%	71.4%	28.6%	76.9%	23.1%	77.5%	22.5%	79.5%	20.5%

TABLE VI

EMPLOYEES' OR SERVICED PERSONS' DIFFICULTIES
WITH THE WRITTEN WORD AS OBSERVED
BY LOCAL AGENCIES

	Employees			Service Experience		
	forms	instruc-tions	picture clues	forms	instruc-tions	picture clues
Cultural 3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Informational 1	0	0	0	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12	0	0	0	9 75.0	11 91.7	10 83.3
Legal 5	2 40.0	0	0	4 80.0	4 80.0	4 80.0
Religious 10	0	0	0	8 80.0	7 70.0	4 40.0
Social/Welfare 11	1 9.1	1 9.1	0	10 90.9	10 90.9	3 27.3
Total of Respondents	3	1	0	32	33	22
Percentage of Respondents	7.1%	2.4%	0.0%	76.2%	78.6%	52.4%

TABLE VII

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF FUNCTIONAL ILLITERACY
TO BE A PROBLEM IN SALINAS

	Yes	No	Undecided	Comments
Cultural 3	1 33.3	1 33.3	1 33.3	The figures aren't bad yet. It's the individual's responsibility.
Informational 1	1 100.0			It's a small problem.
Health/Educ. 12	11 91.7	1 8.3		Not for non-Mexicans. It's probably greater. No matter how small the percentages.
Legal 5	5 100.0			It's a factor in crime. It keeps people from police protection. Not as much a social problem.
Religious 10	9 90.0	1 10.0		Language is the barrier. Extremism is a result of illiteracy. It's a generational thing.
Social/Welfare 11	10 90.9		1 9.1	Take a look at its cause-effect relationship. It's a cultural problem. It's much greater than you say. I could let it go by.
Total of Respondents	37	3	2	
Percentage of Respondents	88.1%	7.1%	4.8%	

Awareness of the Problem

Tables II-VII

Agency representatives interviewed were asked four questions about their awareness of functional illiteracy in Salinas. First, they were asked to define what they considered functionality. Then they were asked to consider other related behaviors from their experience with the community. Next, they were asked about specific task difficulties observed on the job. Last, they were asked their assessment of the handicapping condition.

In defining functional literacy (Question One), agencies answered with a variety of responses. The responses are divided into the five APL general knowledge areas in Table II. The remaining responses as such unidentifiable are considered general communication. Of the responses, 65.7 percent are not competencies for coping with society; they are abilities to communicate in very general kinds of ways. The highest percentage of area knowledge, 20 percent, is in securing and maintaining a job, Health/Education responses for that area being a higher 34.5 percent.

When the same responses are charted according to areas of general communication (Table III), 36.2 percent refer to reading ability, 25.7 percent refer to writing ability. Very few responses refer to listening and speaking abilities. A significant 25.7 percent refer to vague ability levels by task or certification; if this figure were subtracted from that of general communication in Table II, competency and general communication responses would level out (34.4 percent/40.0 percent).

While 65.7 percent of Table II responses fall into the area of general communication, when the question (Two) is narrowed, 76.9 percent of respondents agree the definition varies with each individual's work requirements (Table IV). Social/Welfare respondents overwhelmingly concur with this qualification (90.9 percent); Legal respondents are least consenting (50.0 percent). Some 23.0 percent do not agree to that qualification.

On the question of observable behaviors (Question Three), the interviewer encountered resistance from many agency representatives. While in every case, 65.0-83.3 percent (Table V) agree they have witnessed them in their dealings with the public, their comments and reactions are here noted. Some felt that cultural differences precluded their being indicators of functional illiteracy. Others saw them in their own staff and became defensive. Still others used them to loose radically racial statements. Behaviors are characteristically cultural, and perhaps, for this population, the question is inappropriate.

In every case of observed difficulty with tasks (Question Four), agency representatives agree they have encountered them in public dealings. Of them, 76.2 percent agree they observe difficulties with filling out forms (40.0 percent of Legal agencies and 9.1 percent of Social/Welfare agencies observe staff difficulties); 78.6 percent agree they observe difficulties with reading and understanding instructions (9.1 percent of Social/Welfare agencies observe staff difficulties); and 52.4 percent agree they observe reliance on picture clues to understand written material (Social/Welfare and Religious agencies commented that few graphics were available for clues.). See Table VI.

In response to Question Ten, thirty-seven of forty-two agencies interviewed, or 88.1 percent, assess the situation of functional illiteracy in Salinas as problematic (Table VII). Many argue that reality would prove a higher rate than that suggested.

TABLE VIII

AGENCY KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS
PRESENTLY AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

	Adult School	Hartnell College	We have our own program	Other	I don't know
Cultural 3	3 100.0				
Informational 1	1 100.0				
Health/Educ. 12	7 58.3		1 8.3	1 8.3	3 25.0
Legal 5	2 40.0				3 60.0
Religious 9	8 88.9				1 11.1
Social/Welfare 11	10 90.9	1 9.1			
Total of Respondents	31	1	1	1	7
Percentage of Respondents	75.6%	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%	17.1%

TABLE IX

AGENCY KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PRESENT OR RETIRED LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS

	Public (Hartnell, ABE, Volunteer Bureau)	Private (Sunrise House, Agri-business/ Unions, BSI)	ESL, Citizenship, English on Wheels (for non-natives	Vocational/ Technical training programs	I don't know
Cultural 3					3 100.0
Informational 1	1 100.0				
Health/Educ. 12	3 15.8	3 15.8	3 15.8	4 21.1	6 31.6
Legal 5	1 16.7	2 33.3	1 16.7		2 33.3
Religious 10	2 20.0	1 10.0	1 10.0		6 60.0
Social/Welfare 11	7 41.2	2 11.8	3 17.6	1 5.9	4 23.5
Total of Responses	14	8	8	5	22
Percentage of Responses	25.0%	14.3%	14.3%	8.9%	39.3%

TABLE IX (continued)

35.8% of responses are for programs no longer in operation

Agri-business/Unions are mentioned by 2 (3.6%)
B.S.I. is mentioned by 1 (1.8%)
English on Wheels is mentioned by 5 (8.9%)
Hartnell student tutoring is mentioned by 7 (12.5%)
Sunrise House is mentioned by 2 (3.6%)
Volunteer Bureau is mentioned by 3 (5.4%)

TABLE X

CURRENT AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN LITERACY ACTION

	Referring to agencies	In-house literacy training	Requiring literacy skills	In-service training	Other miscellaneous	Nothing
Cultural 3					1 33.3	3 100.0
Informational 1						1 100.0
Health/Educ. 11	3 27.3	2 18.2	2 18.2	1 9.1	1 9.1	6 54.5
Legal 5	1 20.0	1 20.0			1 20.0	4 80.0
Religious 10	1 10.0	1 10.0	6 60.0		2 20.0	5 50.0
Social/Welfare 11	1 9.1		2 18.2	3 27.3	1 9.1	7 63.6
Total of Respondents	6	4	10	4	6	26
Percentage of Respondents	14.6%	9.8%	24.4%	9.8%	14.6%	63.4%

TABLE XI

WHAT AGENCIES THINK SHOULD BE DONE FOR FUNCTIONAL ILLITERATES IN SALINAS

	Individual consid-eration	Program consid-eration	Support consid-eration	It is being done	Nothing
Cultural 3	3 37.5	2 25.0	1 12.5	2 25.0	
Informational 1	1 100.0				
Health/Educ. 12	7 33.3	10 47.6	2 9.5	2 9.5	
Legal 5		5 83.3		1 16.7	
Religious 10	5 35.7	6 42.9	2 14.3		1 7.1
Social/Welfare 11	1 6.3	9 56.3	4 25.0	1 6.3	1 6.3
Total of Responses	17	32	9	6	2
Percentage of Responses	25.8%	48.4%	13.6%	9.1%	3.0%

Knowledge of Programs

Tables VIII-XI

Agency representatives were asked four questions about their knowledge of local literacy programs. First, they were asked to identify the program to which they would refer someone at this time. Then, they were asked to add the names of other programs of which they were aware, either presently active or since retired. Next, they were asked what they were doing about literacy on a company level. Last, they were asked what they thought should be done.

Most interview respondents, 75.6 percent, are aware of the Adult School program (Table VIII) and will refer to its services for assistance (Question Five). Some, 17.1 percent, admit they do not know of any literacy programs. A wide range of further responses follow with Question Six, and, other than exclusive vocational/technical training classes, 17.8 percent of those responses include programs currently available to the public, also through the Adult School. About one-third of the responses, 35.8 percent, include programs not available. Of the interviewees responding, 39.3 percent replied, "I don't know."

Over half of the respondents, 63.4 percent, admit they are doing nothing about literacy. Of the others, 24.4 percent say they require literacy competence in their tasks. A few, 14.6 percent, say they refer to other agencies, while 14.6 percent say they encourage literacy. Four agencies, or 9.8 percent, have their own in-house literacy training. Another four agencies, or 9.8 percent, say they have their own in-service

training programs.

When agencies were asked what they thought should be done (Question Eight), their responses fell into five areas (Table XI). Most responses, 48.4 percent, consider the responsibility that of program organization or operation. Others, 25.8 percent, consider the responsibility that of the individual functional illiterate, his situation, motivation, and ambition. Few, 13.6 percent, consider the responsibility that of support systems at national, state, and local levels. Of the remaining responses to what should be done, 9.1 percent consider what is offered now as adequate, and 3.0 percent consider the effort hopeless.

TABLE XII

IN WHAT AREAS AGENCIES WOULD BE WILLING TO OFFER FOUNDATIONAL SUPPORT

	Funding	Supplying volunteers	Participating in literacy commission	Unidentified support	None
Cultural 3					3 100.0
Informational 1					1 100.0
Health/Educ. 11		3 27.3	4 36.4	4 36.4	2 18.2
Legal 4		1 25.0	3 75.0	1 25.0	
Religious 10	1 10.0	4 40.0	4 40.0	9 90.0	
Social/Welfare 11	2 18.2	5 45.5	6 54.5	3 27.3	1 9.1
Total of Respondents	3	13	17	17	7
Percentage of Respondents	12.5%	32.5%	42.5%	42.5%	17.5%

TABLE XIII

IN WHAT AREAS AGENCIES WOULD BE WILLING TO OFFER OUTREACH ASSISTANCE

	TV/Radio campaigns	Word of mouth	Community awareness plan	Letters to the editor	Phone or door contacts	Other	None
Cultural 3			1 33.3				2 66.7
Informational 1			1 100.0				
Health/Educ. 11		7 63.6	5 45.5		1 9.1		1 9.1
Legal 4		2 50.0			1 25.0	2 50.0	3 75.0
Religious 10		1 10.0	1 10.0	1 10.0	1 10.0	8 80.0	5 50.0
Social/Welfare 11	1 9.1	5 45.5	5 45.5		1 9.1	7 63.6	
Total of Respondents	1	15	13	1	4	17	11
Percentage of Respondents	2.5%	37.5%	32.5%	2.5%	10.0%	42.5%	27.5%

Willingness to Support

Tables XII-XIII

Agency representatives were asked two questions about their willingness to support a community-wide literacy effort in Salinas. First, they were asked if and how they would be willing to foundationally support a program. Second, they were asked if and how they would be willing to progressively support a program.

In response to Question Nine, shown in Table XII, most agency representatives, 42.5 percent, indicate a willingness to manage the affairs of a literacy program by serving on a commission. The same number agree to lend unidentified moral support. Fewer, 32.5 percent, offer to provide volunteers for various tasks. Still fewer, 12.5 percent, offer to provide funding, those being from Social/Welfare and Religious agencies who have made a commitment to serve the community needs. Some, 17.5 percent, admit they cannot or will not provide foundational support.

In response to Question Twelve, as shown in Table XIII, agency representatives indicate an understanding of information channels in the community network which most directly affect the functional illiterate. Some respondents, 37.5 percent, are willing to refer and disseminate information. Fewer, 32.5 percent, are willing to be part of a community awareness plan. Still fewer, 10.0 percent, are willing to make or help in direct contacts with the functionally illiterate. While 27.5 percent admit an unwillingness to participate in outreach, 42.5 percent mention other ongoing involvements with the students once in the program.

Although in response to Question Eleven, as shown in Table XV, a high percentage of respondents, 73.8 percent, favor TV/Radio campaigns for outreach, only one agency indicates a willingness to assist in that regard. And, although 33.3 percent agree to the effectiveness of letters to the editor, only one agency indicates a willingness to assist in that regard.

TABLE XIV

EVALUATION OF LOCAL LITERACY ACTION INADEQUACY

	Individuals		Programs		Support		
	internal	external	internal	external	internal	external	Other
Cultural 3	3 33.3	2 22.2	1 11.1			1 11.1	2 22.2
Informational 1							1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12	24 52.2	7 15.2			2 4.3	10 21.7	3 6.5
Legal 5	7 43.8	2 12.5	2 12.5	1 6.3	1 6.3	1 6.3	2 12.5
Religious 10	22 59.5	2 5.4	4 10.8			3 8.1	6 16.2
Social/Welfare 11	7 31.8	3 13.6	1 4.5		2 9.1	5 22.7	4 18.2
Total of Responses	63	16	8	1	5	20	18
Percentage of Responses (columns)	48.1%	12.2%	6.1%	0.8%	3.8%	15.3%	13.7%
Percentage of Responses (sections)	60.3%		6.9%		19.1%		

Evaluation of Present Situation

Table XIV

Agency representatives were asked why so few programs are available in Salinas, why so few students are enrolled in them, and why more is not being done for the functionally illiterate (Question Thirteen). Of forty-two agencies responding, one hundred thirty-one comments are recorded in Table XIV. The highest percentage of responses is related to the individual himself, 60.3 percent, with most of those responses directed to his internal/emotional situation, 48.1 percent, rather than to his external environment, 12.2 percent. The second highest percentage of responses is related to support systems, 19.1 percent, with the greater number directed to external sources, 15.3 percent, rather than internal structures, 3.8 percent. Other comments, 13.7 percent, concern negation of the question as posed and political cultural kinds of remarks that do not fall into given categories. The least number of responses, 6.9 percent, is related to programs, 6.1 percent to internal organization and operation, and 0.8 percent to external structure and function.

TABLE XV

EFFECTIVE INFORMATION CHANNELS
FOR PROGRAM OUTREACH

	TV/Radio campaigns	Word of mouth	Community awareness plan	Letters to the editor	Phone or door contacts	Other
Cultural 3	3 100.0	3 100.0	2 66.7	1 33.3	1 33.3	2 66.7
Informational 1	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0		1 100.0	
Health/Educ. 12	10 83.3	12 100.0	7 58.3	1 8.3	4 33.3	9 75.0
Legal 5	3 60.0	4 80.0	3 60.0	1 20.0	4 80.0	4 80.0
Religious 10	7 70.0	8 80.0	9 90.0	5 50.0	9 90.0	8 80.0
Social/Welfare 11	7 63.6	9 81.8	10 90.9	6 54.5	7 63.6	11 100.0
Total of Respondents	31	37	32	14	26	34
Percentage of Respondents	73.8%	88.1%	76.2%	33.3%	61.9%	81.0%

TABLE XVI

DEFINITION OR PERCEPTION ALTERATION
FOR AGENCIES DURING INTERVIEW

	Yes	No	Comments
Cultural 3	1 33.3	2 66.7	I've always been aware of Hispanic problems with language.
Informational 1		1 100.0	
Health/Educ. 12	8 66.7	4 33.3	What I thought isn't happening, isn't. I thought there were more classes. It made me stop and think.
Legal 5	1 20.0	4 80.0	It added depth to my understanding.
Religious 10	6 60.0	4 40.0	It's a language barrier. I never thought about it. I only thought about language ability.
Social/Welfare 11	7 63.6	4 36.4	I never thought about it before. It expanded my awareness of figures, behaviors, and possibilities.
Total of Respondents	23	19	
Percentage of Respondents	54.8%	45.2%	

TABLE XVII

CENSORSHIP OF AGENCY RESPONSES

	Yes	No
Cultural 3		3 100.0
Informational 1		1 100.0
Health/Educ. 12	2 16.7	10 83.3
Legal 5	1 20.0	4 80.0
Religious 10		10 100.0
Social/Welfare 11	1 9.1	10 90.9
Total of Respondents	4	38
Percentage of Respondents	9.5%	90.5%

Summary

Data gathered from an open-form questionnaire interview with forty-two local Salinas agencies is charted in Tables II-XVII. The information is intended to substantiate or nullify this researcher's hypothesis. It is, therefore, tabulated to arrive at some general conclusions regarding that hypothesis.

Tables II-VII tabulate comments in response to questions about problem awareness. Tables VIII-XI tabulate comments in response to questions about program knowledge. Tables XII-XIII tabulate comments in response to questions about willingness to participate. Table XIV tabulates comments in response to a question eliciting agency assessment of the present situation. Tables XV-XVII are included for reference only.

For some questions, agencies are limited to one response, for others, they are allowed unlimited responses. Two methods of presenting data, therefore, seem acceptable. One method involves the tabulation of data in percentages by the number of agencies responding. The other method involves the tabulation of data in percentages by the total number of responses given. The distinction can be noted only in attending to the data as organized. Brief analysis follows each section of related tables, highlighting results of inquiry.

It is impossible in an unrestricted questionnaire form to adequately represent in table form the many comments given. An attempt has been made to allow for those remarks by use of an "Other" column in tables in which the frequency of "Other" responses is significant to mention. In the discussion of research findings, these comments will be acknowledged for clarification as appropriate.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Description of the Procedure

One hundred eighteen agencies (see Appendix A) were contacted by letter requesting a thirty-minute interview (see Appendix B). A self-addressed stamped postcard was also enclosed for responding (see Appendix C). Of those agencies contacted, 33 percent did not reply, and 12 percent did not receive the letters, which were returned unopened. Of the 55 percent who did reply, 8 percent refused to be interviewed, 3 percent were unable to provide information as requested, and 8 percent were unable to make connection with the researcher for one reason or another. Those who were interviewed are listed here by type, for purposes of analysis:

CULTURAL AGENCIES
Art Unlimited
Mo. Co. Historical Society
Salinas Concert Association

INFORMATIONAL AGENCY
El Sol Spanish Newspaper

HEALTH/EDUCATION AGENCIES
Alcohol Programs Management
Bard Blades School
CA E.D.D.
C.E.T.A.
Center for Employment Training
Door to Hope
Hartnell College
Memorial Hospital
Salinas City School District
Sanborn Road Clinic
Trucha
Women's Crisis Line

LEGAL AGENCIES
CA Parole & Comm. Serv. Div.
CA Rural Legal Assistance
Mo. Co. Dept. of Elections
Mo. Co. District Attorney
Sheriff's Department

RELIGIOUS AGENCIES
Baptist First
Calvary Assembly of God
Calvary Baptist
First Christian
First Presbyterian
Luth. Ch. of the Good Shepherd
Madonna del Sasso
St. George's Episcopal
Salinas Christian Fellowship
Temple Beth El

SOCIAL/WELFARE AGENCIES
4-H

SOCIAL/WELFARE AGENCIES (continued)
Friends Outside
L.U.L.A.C.
Mo. Co. Dept. of Social Services
Mo. Co. Housing Authority
Senior Citizen's Advisory Council
Social Security Administration
Sunrise House
United Way
Volunteer Bureau
Y.M.C.A.

A questionnaire was developed for use in the interviews. Two individuals with research experience examined the questionnaire and suggested changes as reflected in the final form (see Appendix D). A response sheet for use in the interviews was developed and Xeroxed to record agency responses (see Appendix E).

Interviews of thirty minutes each were conducted within a three week period from March 21 through April 8, 1983. Interviews were not taped as the researcher wanted relaxed, spontaneous responses and freedom of expression unconstrained. Interview response sheets are, however, available on request.

Interview questions addressed the concerns of the hypothesis, which are threefold: 1) awareness of functional illiteracy in Salinas: "Salinas agencies who have contact with the functionally illiterate population are aware that a large number of people in the community have difficulty with the English language. The agencies consider this difficulty an Hispanic problem and an individual responsibility."; 2) knowledge of local literacy programs: "These same agencies are generally aware of the programs through Adult School and consider them adequate."; and 3) willingness to support a community-wide literacy effort: "They are not directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy, nor do they intend to be. Their lack of support has inhibited literacy efforts

in the community."

Principal Findings

Awareness of functional illiteracy in Salinas. Salinas agencies are, in fact, aware that a large number of people in the community have difficulty with the English language. The very conservative figure of between 2 and 8 percent suggested during the interview was challenged by many respondents as less than reality. There were 88.1 percent or thirty-seven of the forty-two agencies who agreed that functional illiteracy was a problem in Salinas.

Agency representatives, when asked what they considered necessary for proficiency, responded in one of three ways. Approximately 25.7 percent favor vague ability levels by certification or grade completion; 34.4 percent favor competencies, the majority of which refer to job security; and 40.0 percent favor general communication skills. The second group, those who favor competencies, define functional literacy in terms of completing prescribed tasks, and the third group, those who favor general communication skills, define functional literacy in terms of surviving spontaneously in any given situation. However, when questioned as to whether the definition varies for individuals according to their job demands, 76 percent of respondents (which is the second and third groups as well as some of the first) agree.

It seems, therefore, that agencies do not consider functional literacy to involve participation in community life and responsibilities, or only in so far as it relates to job life and responsibilities. Even those who favor communication skills refer mainly to reading and writing abilities; very few responses, 6 to 10 percent, refer to listening,

speaking and understanding abilities. Even areas of competency are not fully covered; no responses, including those from Health/Education agencies, mention health knowledge, only one response mentions community resources knowledge, five responses involve consumer economics knowledge, and nine involve government and law knowledge, only one being from the Legal agencies. Occupational knowledge surpasses all others. The job seems to be the goal, the focus. There is little comprehension of literacy involving the whole person.

Agency representatives were asked Question Three, as recorded in Table V, p. 32, for the purpose of identifying characteristic behaviors. At that point, agencies began to give clear messages concerning their perceptions of the problem. As behaviors were listed, they were purposely not defined. Interviewees were requested to qualify their answers as they felt the need to do so. Many hesitated even answering the questions, protesting that they reflected cultural diversity and were not appropriate measures for assessment of functional illiterates.

The condition of functional illiteracy was identified as an ESL problem by many agencies; those who deal with individuals who are in legal trouble or on welfare rolls responded with less biased comments. Throughout the interview, however, 66.7 percent of agency representatives suggest that it is an Hispanic problem; some admit that the language barrier and consequent racism overshadows any realization of Whites lacking functional literacy. Their comments include, "The community would never admit English speakers have a problem," "The Whites' problem is not as obvious," and "90 percent is Spanish speaking."

When asked whose responsibility it was (Question Thirteen, Table XIII), an overwhelming 60.3 percent of responses faulted the individual.

Of those, 79.7 percent of responses suggested the individuals' conflicts were internal in nature, i.e. embarrassment, fear, pride, etc. Meanwhile, the heartbeat of the community, its agencies, expects no more than the job demands. In fact, in many Social/Welfare, Health/Education, and Legal agencies, personnel are not requiring individuals to fill out forms anymore; they do it for them. Yet, beyond the form-filling tasks, the individual is responsible for the fine print. For that there is a problem, a language problem, an Hispanic problem. But, "Menial jobs have to be done," and, "Employers can keep [functional illiterates] in their place."

Knowledge of local literacy programs. When asked about local literacy programs, agency representatives indicated a general knowledge of the Adult School availability and mentioned it as the place they would refer someone today. Few actually identified specific programs with the Adult School for specific needs; in fact, common responses of "Adult School or ESL" reveal a lack of educational structure understanding. In response to Question Five, thirty-one interviewees named Adult School for first referral, and in response to Question Six, an additional ten responses made mention of its currently available programs. It can be stated, therefore, that agencies are generally aware of the programs through Adult School.

A startling 17.1 percent of respondents indicate they know of no literacy programs and 39.3 percent of responses to Question Six indicate they know of none in the past. Behavioral Sciences Institute (BSI) until recently performed an educationally respected diagnostic, prescriptive, and referral service. English on Wheels (Lotte Marcus, 1972-80) provided

intensive literacy education to more than 1500 non-native speakers. Sunrise House offered literacy training through psychological/social services to Salinas youth, boasting unmitigated successes. Hartnell College students tutored many Sunrise young people during that period of operation. Agri-businesses and Unions sponsored programs for workers until recent years, providing opportunities for improved literacy to laborers as well as to foremen. However, only 35.8 percent of responses mentioned any of these or other programs no longer available. In addition, only 8.9 percent of responses indicate a knowledge of vocational/technical training programs.

In reply to the question of what should be done, 3.0 percent of responses consider the effort hopeless, while 9.1 percent consider the current effort sufficient. Of the remainder, 48.4 percent of responses indicate it a program responsibility, 25.8 percent indicate it an individual responsibility, and 13.6 percent indicate it a support systems responsibility. The consensus seems to be that programs need to be established and individuals need to take advantage of them in virtual isolation from support systems at national, state, or local levels. Otherwise, agencies are satisfied with the status quo.

Comparing these responses to those of Question Thirteen, Table XIII, p. 46, leads to conclusions about the adequacy of present literacy programs as offered through Adult School. The majority of responses, 60.3 percent, blame any inadequacy on the individuals, 79.7 percent of those to their internal makeup, while only 6.9 percent of responses attribute any inadequacy to program conditions. Of those mentioning support inadequacy (19.1 percent), 80.0 percent consider it an external support inadequacy, 50 percent of those mentioned by Health/Education agencies who recognize

the value of external support. In other words, inadequacy of literacy education lies not with the programs or lack of programs but rather with the individuals themselves who will not pull themselves out of their condition by themselves.

Willingness to support a community-wide literacy effort. Current involvement by local agencies in the alleviation of functional illiteracy speaks poorly for the leadership of the community. A mere 14.6 percent are referring individuals to Adult School programs. Few, 9.8 percent, have their own programs and another 9.8 percent provide in-service for their staff in encoding/decoding technical jargon. A remarkable 63.4 percent of agency representatives admit their agencies are doing nothing in the area of literacy action. The 24.4 percent who require literacy skills from employees, parishioners, and/or service recipients may bring that figure to 87.8 percent, as their expectations do not necessarily involve action.

After being presented with very conservative figures, agency representatives were asked in what way they could give foundational support. Most agencies complain about being able to foundationally support themselves. Funding claims 12.5 percent affirmative responses: one from a church with funds for local missionary endeavors, and two from social agencies designed to collect and funnel funds into community projects. Volunteering staff is viewed as a possibility by 32.5 percent of respondents. The most popular area is literacy commission participation with 42.5 percent responding affirmatively. There are also the 17.5 percent who will not commit their agencies to any area.

When support assumes a more interactive role with the functionally

illiterate, agencies tend to back off. Comparing Tables XV and XIII, pp. 51 and 46, illustrates that point. While 73.8 percent see the need for TV/Radio campaigns, 2.5 percent will be involved with them. While 88.1 percent see the need for referral, 37.5 percent will be involved with it. While 76.2 percent see the need for a community awareness plan, 32.5 percent will be involved with it. While 33.3 percent recognize the effectiveness of letters to the editor, 2.5 percent will respond in that manner. While 61.9 percent see the need for phone or door to door contacts, 10.0 percent will be involved with it. While 81.0 percent give other suggestions for outreach, 42.5 percent volunteer themselves to be involved with them. There are also the 27.5 percent who will not commit their agencies to any area.

One Social/Welfare agency stands alone in its willingness to participate in TV/Radio campaigns. One Religious agency stands alone in its willingness to write to the editor. Both Religious and Legal agencies speak loudly in favor of a community awareness plan but show little or no active interest. No area of outreach support indicates a more than token willingness on the part of local agencies to become directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy in Salinas.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restatement of the Problem

Salinas is a community nestled in a fertile agricultural valley. It has continually drawn immigrants and migrant workers because of its employment opportunities. Presently, its population is comprised of 50.48 percent Whites and 49.52 percent non-Whites, of which 39.68 percent are Mexican-Americans. According to APL assessment, between 2 and 12 percent of the population is having serious difficulty coping with language; 25 to 27 percent is having difficulty. Approximately 5 percent is enrolled in Adult School ESL and Citizenship classes; 0.1 percent is enrolled in Adult School ABE classes. These are the only literacy classes available to the general public in Salinas.

Persons contacted in the initial stage of research cited a variety of resource programs: AARP teaching Laubach, Volunteer Bureau providing tutors, Sunrise House field-tutoring, Hartnell College students tutoring, evening neighborhood ABE classes, and Lotte Marcus' English on Wheels program. None of these resources is any longer available. Considering the figures of those who are in need of literacy education as compared to those enrolled, the researcher questioned the city climate for literacy action.

This study examined answers to the following three questions addressed to community agencies and discussed in the preceding chapter:

1) What is your awareness of the problem?, 2) What is your knowledge of existing or retired programs?, and 3) What is your agency's commitment to support of a community-wide program?

Conclusions

The research gathered substantiates the hypothesis as stated:

> Salinas agencies who have contact with the functionally illiterate population are aware that a large number of people in the community have difficulty with the English language. The agencies consider this difficulty an Hispanic problem and an individual responsibility. These same agencies are generally aware of the programs through Adult School and consider them adequate. They are not directly involved in the alleviation of functional illiteracy, nor do they intend to be. Their lack of support has inhibited literacy efforts in the community.

Of forty-two agencies interviewed, 88.1 percent admit that Salinas has a literacy problem, and 76 to 78 percent encounter individuals who are thus handicapped on a weekly, sometimes daily, basis. At least 75 percent know about Adult School programs, but only 14.6 percent refer individuals to those programs, although 88.1 percent agree it is the most effective method of outreach, and 37.5 percent say they will be supportive of literacy efforts in that way. The bulk of the community's responsibility is that of program organization and operation, as per 48.4 percent of agency responses. Any inadequacies are cited by 6.9 percent of responses to be in the area of program provision, 60.3 percent of responses to be those of the individual functional illiterates. The majority of the problem is considered to be of the Hispanic population by 66.7 percent of interviewed agencies. Since 74.4 percent identify the problem a concern mainly in the realm of employment, it is no wonder that 63.4 percent are doing nothing about it. Not only do literacy leaders, now on the periphery, attribute inhibited efforts to lack of city support, but data seems to

suggest a satisfaction on the part of city agencies with the conditions as they are.

The threat of illiterates understanding the system which has victimized them and being able to have an intelligent voice and be heard, coupled with the belief that these in subject are those of other nationalities who are steadily increasing in number and residence, poses serious difficulty for a conservative community in change.

Any innovative literacy effort will either have to be sanctioned by existing programs, better still emerging from within, or follow a comprehensive community awareness plan with an emphasis on agency education. Adult School has won the approval of the city managers. Additional offerings would not have to compete if they cooperated under an authorized umbrella. Otherwise, it is clear that agencies will counter new approaches unless they are educated as to the causes and consequences of functional illiteracy in relation to community life and growth. Conceptions concerning definition of functional literacy by occupational competency, assignment of responsibility to functional illiterates, and support of efforts mainly from those within the educational context naturally inhibit new innovations particularly those for which literacy is the long-range goal. A necessary albeit radical change in community attitude demands dramatic media coverage as well as workshop participation. Within or without Adult School, any innovative literacy effort requires invincible leadership.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is recommended that a similar survey be conducted using a closed-form questionnaire, after examination of the data-gathering method

employed in this study. Suggested behavioral traits can be designed to more carefully reflect the condition of functional illiterates in Salinas by use of hypothetical situations. Limiting choice of response will limit the freedom of expression, but it will also eliminate the possibility of "Other" responses which may skew percentage results.

It is also recommended that a study investigate why agri-businesses do not provide literacy education for their migrant workers. Sticht (Kirsch p. 491) is the only study known which shows low correlation between functional literacy and increased productivity. If agri-businesses have likewise found that to be true, by experience, a study will add credence to Sticht's findings and create a major impact on the whole nature of functional literacy assessment criteria.

Another recommendation, suggested by many of this study's participants, is that a discovery be made of the number who want literacy education. Target areas would have to be canvassed and attractive incentives provided for the educationally disadvantaged adults in Salinas. Some of this study's participants informed the researcher of since terminated neighborhood classes conducted at night in elementary schools around the city. From their comments, the classes were well attended as they went out to the people at a time when even long-hour workers could attend. Although ESL is not literacy education, it is available at present during the evening but in headquartered buildings to which students must find transportation (see Appendix F). The needs for availability and accessibility will both have to be addressed.

Finally, it is recommended that a study examine what difference the educational experience has made in the lives of students in Salinas Adult School programs. None of them is really addressing literacy as

defined in this study, as the formats are competency-based and the goals are short-term survival oriented. It would be interesting to compare responses of students, staff, and administrators and/or to compare them with those of another program offering literacy education that addresses literacy as defined in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anders, Patricia L. "Tests of Functional Literacy," Journal of Reading, April, 1981, pp. 612-19.

Anderson, Lorin W. and Jo Craig Anderson. "Functional Literacy Tests: A Case of Anticipatory Validity?" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3:51-55, March-April, 1981.

Atkinson, Bill. "Literacy, Minimal Competence, and What We Can Learn from Iceland: Suggestions on How to Cope with the Literacy Crisis," Education Canada, Fall, 1981, pp. 24-29.

Bingham, Grace, and others. Educational Assessment and Instructional Strategies for Adult Exceptional Learners: Final Report. ERIC Document No. 167-724, July, 1978.

Bormuth, John R. "Reading Literacy: Its Definition and Assessment," Toward a Literate Society, eds. John B. Carroll and Jeanne Chall. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Bush, Barbara. "Why We Can't Afford Illiteracy, and What We Can Do About It," Foundation News, January/February, 1983, pp. 18-21.

Bush, Inetta. "What It's Like When You Can't Read or Write," U. S. News & World Report, 92:57, May 17, 1982.

City of Salinas Department of Community Development. Answers to the Most Commonly Asked Questions About Population, Housing, and Employment in Salinas, Salinas, 1983.

Cook, Wanda Dauksza. Adult Literacy Education in the United States. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1977.

Couvert, Roger. The Evaluation of Literacy Programmes: A Practical Guide. France: UNESCO, 1979.

Donnelley Marketing Information Services. Market Profile Analysis, Salinas, Seaside, Monterey, CA. SMSA, 1982.

Drennan, Henry. "Libraries and Literacy Education," Catholic Library World, April, 1981, pp. 376-85.

Fischer, Joan Keller. "A Review of Competency-Based Adult Education," Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978, pp. 7-32.

Freire, Paulo. "The Adult Literacy Process as Cultural Action for Freedom," Harvard Educational Review, 40:205-25, May, 1970.

Gallini, Joan K., and others. An Investigation of the Relationship Between a Measure of Functional Literacy and Level of Functioning in Society. ERIC Document No. 214-997, 1980.

Gambrell, Linda B. and Betty S. Heathington. "Adult Disabled Readers' Metacognitive Awareness About Reading Tasks and Strategies," Journal of Reading Behavior, 13:215-22, Fall, 1981.

Greene, Maxine. "Literacy for What?" Education Digest, 47:2-5, May, 1982.

Harman, David. "Illiteracy: An Overview," Harvard Educational Review, 40:226-43, May, 1970.

Hunter, Carman St. John with David Harman. Adult Illiteracy in the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Kirsch, Irwin and John T. Guthrie. "The Concept and Measurement of Functional Literacy," Reading Research Quarterly, 13:485-507, 1977-1978.

Kozol, Jonathan. Prisoners of Silence: Breaking the Bonds of Adult Illiteracy in the United States. New York: Continuum, 1980.

Kratz, Russel J. Implications of Self-directed Learning for Functionally Illiterate Adults. ERIC Document No. 185-247, August 29, 1980.

Leiner, Marvin. "Educational Change in Cuba," Education Digest, 47:44-45, May, 1982.

Lerner, Barbara. "The Minimum Competence Testing Movement: Social, Scientific, and Legal Implications," American Psychologist, 36:1057-66, October, 1981.

Levine, Kenneth. "Functional Literacy: Fond Illusions and False Economies," Harvard Educational Review, 52:249-66, August, 1982.

Martinez, Armando. "Literacy Through Democratization of Education," Harvard Educational Review, 40:280-82, May, 1970.

McGovern, The Honorable George. Joint Resolution to Establish a National Commission on Literacy, including a statement of September 8, 1978, The Miseducation of Millions: The Alarming Rise of Functional Illiteracy in America. 96th Congress, 1st Session, Senate, Document No. 53. [Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979].

Monterey County Human Services Planning Team with assistance from Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and Midcoast Health Systems Agency. Monterey County Profile. Salinas, January, 1980, rev. June, 1980.

O'Neil, Wayne. "Properly Literate," Harvard Educational Review, 40:260-63, May, 1970.

The Philippines: Parts 1 and 2, World Education Series. New York: World Education, March 26, 1979. ERIC Document No. 162-075.

Postman, Neil. "The Politics of Reading," Harvard Educational Review, 40:244-52, May, 1970.

Ronan, Michael B. A Collaborative Approach to Adult Education: The Andragogy Model. ERIC Document No. 197-090, May, 1980.

Sanoff, Alvin P. "Why 'The Survival Mentality' is Rife in America: A Conversation with Christopher Lesch," U. S. News & World Report, 92:59-60, May 17, 1982.

Taylor, Paul G. "Selected Issues in Competency-Based Adult Education: A Delphi Study," Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978, pp. 33-50.

Torrey, Jane "Illiteracy in the Ghetto," Harvard Educational Review, 40: 253-59, May, 1970.

Ulmer, Curtis. "Adult Competency Based Instruction," Community College Review, Spring, 1981, pp. 51-56.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, September, 1978. ERIC Document No. 162-147.

University of Texas at Austin. Adult Functional Competency: A Summary. March, 1975.

Wellborn, Stanley N. "Ahead: A Nation of Illiterates?" U. S. News & World Report, 92:53-56, May 17, 1982.

Williams, Roger M. "Illiterate? Who, us?" Foundation News, January/February, 1983, pp. 12-15.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Comprehensive List of Agencies Contacted

CULTURAL AGENCIES

* Art Unlimited
* Monterey County Historical Society
* Salinas Concert Association
Salinas Fine Arts Club
Salinas Performing Arts

INFORMATIONAL AGENCIES

* El Sol Spanish Newspaper
John Steinbeck Library
Monterey Bay Area Cooperative Library System
Monterey County Public Library
Salinas Californian

HEALTH/EDUCATION AGENCIES

* Alcohol Programs Management
Alisal Community Hospital
* Bard Blades School
California Department of Mental Health
California Department of Rehabilitation
* California Employment Development Department
Candelaria Native American Employment and Training Program
* Center for Employment Training
* CETA-WIN Intake Center
* Door to Hope for Women
Experience, Inc.
* Hartnell College
Mid-Coast Health Systems Agency
Monterey Bay Dental Society
Monterey County Health Department
Monterey County Medical Society

HEALTH/EDUCATION (continued)

Monterey County Office of Education
Natividad Medical Center
Planned Parenthood of Monterey County
Rehabilitation Educational Assistance Program, Creative Learning Center
Salinas Adult School
* Salinas City School District
Salinas Union High School District
* Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital
* Sanborn Road Clinic
* Trucha
* Women's Crisis Line

LEGAL AGENCIES

Agri-Park
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
California Agriculture Labor Relations Board
California Council on Criminal Justice, Region M
California Department of Developmental Services
California Department of Industrial Relations--Division of Labor Standards Enforcement
California Department of Industrial Relations--Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration
California Department of Industrial Relations--Fair Employment Practices
California Department of Motor Vehicles
* California Parole and Community Services Division
* California Rural Legal Assistance

LEGAL AGENCIES (continued)

Central Coast Resource Conservation and Development Area
Legal Aid Society of Monterey County
* Monterey County Department of Elections
* Monterey County District Attorney's Office
Monterey County Probation Department
* Monterey County Sheriff's Department
National League of Women Voters
Salinas Chamber of Commerce

RELIGIOUS AGENCIES

Apostolic Assembly Bethel Temple
* Baptist First Church of Salinas
Baptist Temple of Salinas
Buddhist Temple of Salinas
* Calvary Assembly of God
* Calvary Baptist Church of Salinas
Christchurch Salinas Foursquare Gospel
Church of Christ
Church of God
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
* First Christian Church
First Church of Christ Scientist
First United Methodist Church of Salinas
First United Pentecostal Church
* First United Presbyterian Church
Jehovah's Witness--Laurel Congregation
Laurel Baptist Church
* Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd
* Madonna del Sasso Parish
Oak Park Community Church
Royal Family Church of God in Christ
* St. George's Episcopal Church
St. John the Baptist Greek Orthodox Church
* Salinas Christian Fellowship
Salinas Church of Religious Science
Salinas Church of the Nazarene
Salinas Full Gospel Church
Seventh-Day Adventist Church

RELIGIOUS AGENCIES (continued)

* Temple Beth El
Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Salinas
Victory Mission

SOCIAL/WELFARE AGENCIES

Boy Scouts of America--Monterey Bay Area Council
Camp Fire, Santa Lucia Council
Disabled American Veterans #101
Easter Seal Society of Monterey County
Filipino Community of Salinas Valley
* 4-H
* Friends Outside
Girl Scouts, Monterey Bay Council
Goodwill Industries
* League of United Latin American Citizens
March of Dimes National Foundation; South Bay Chapter, Monterey Bay Division
Monterey County Department of Social Services--Benefits Division
* Monterey County Department of Social Services--Social Work Division
* Monterey County Housing Authority
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Retired Senior Volunteer Program
Saint Vincent De Paul
Salinas Family Emergency Shelter
Salinas Valley Child Abuse Prevention Council
Salvation Army
* Senior Citizen Advisory Commission
* Social Security Administration Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Suicide Prevention Center of Monterey Council
* Sunrise House
Swinging Door
Tri-County Mexican American Unity Council
* United Way
* Volunteer Bureau of Salinas Voluntary Action Center
Welcome Wagon International

SOCIAL/WELFARE AGENCIES (continued)

Women for Women

* Young Men's Christian Association

* Agencies interviewed for this research study.

APPENDIX B

Letter of Request for Interview

1505 Caceras Circle
Salinas, California 93906
March 14, 1983

Allow me to introduce myself. I am Barbara Holian, teacher/librarian at Salinas High School and graduate student at San Jose State University. For a final project in my university studies, I am conducting research for which I would appreciate your assistance.

My project will attempt to determine community assessment of its functionally illiterate adult population. It will involve gathering information from various sources among which will be community agencies and organizations (about 100) by means of a survey questionaire.

I have about 15 questions I would like to ask you as a representative of your group. I will visit your office at your convenience and appreciate a 20 minute block of time for this short interview. I enclose a self-addressed postcard for your response as to preferred time and contact person.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to meet with you. I am grateful for your prompt response.

Respectfully yours,

Barbara Holian

APPENDIX C

Return Response Postcard

Ms. Holian,
Someone will be happy to meet with you as you have requested on the date and at the time indicated below:

March 21, 22, 23, 24, April 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

late afternoon (3-5 PM) evening

March 28, 29, 30, 31

morning afternoon evening

(Please circle date and time slot preferred.)

Specific time best?_____

Saturdays ok? _____ Sundays ok? _____

Contact Person _____

Phone # for appt. verification _____

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions

FILL IN INFORMATION AT TOP OF RESPONSE SHEET.

1. How do you define functional literacy? A person is functionally literate when he . . .
2. Would you add anything to your definition when you consider a work environment?
3. Other literacy program staff have, with the help of agencies identified local functional illiterates who are adept at concealing their handicap. These disadvantaged adults exhibited certain characteristic behaviors. In your business/profession, do you ever encounter individuals who consistently
   a. lack intellectual abilities?
   b. lack professional skills?
   c. lack conscientiousness?
   d. neglect safety regulations?
   e. lack know how?
   f. demonstrate difficulties or hostility with regard to new techniques or products?
   g. demonstrate anti-progressive attitudes and behavior?
4. In addition, are there any people in your employ or service experience who have demonstrated real difficulty with the written word in filling out forms, reading instructions, or relying on pictures to read material?

5. Where would you send them in Salinas if they appeared open to literacy education?
6. Are you aware of other local literacy programs either once active or currently active?
7. Are you doing anything on a company level to promote literacy skills?
8. What do you think should be done for that segment of society?
9. There are volunteer programs springing up all over the country supported by national, state, and local agencies, and staffed by local volunteers. These programs attest to measurable growth in the individuals they tutor which translates into economic, political, and social progress for the community it represents. Would your organization be willing to support such an effort through funding, supplying volunteers, or participating in a community literacy commission?
10. Traditionally, illiterates have numbered in the population with less than five years of schooling, without reading and writing abilities, and/or less than adequate living wages. That amounts to between 2.5 and 8 percent or 2,000 to 7,000 people in Salinas alone, not including those who have not been counted by census data staff. With that in mind, do you think that Salinas has a literacy problem?
11. How could these persons be most effectively reached for assistance?
    a. TV/Radio campaigns?
    b. Word of mouth?
    c. Community awareness plan?
    d. Letters to the editor?
    e. Phone or door-to-door contacts?
    f. Other?

12. Is there anything in the list just mentioned that your agency would be willing to do?
13. I have discovered through my community contacts that the only programs available are in the Adult School, although there have been many others some of which you may have already identified (Behavioral Sciences Institute, English on Wheels, Hartnell College tutors, Laubach with retired teachers in Salinas, Sunrise House, and the Volunteer Bureau). The coordinator of ABE informed me that maybe two or three English-speaking persons enrolled in her program would be considered functionally illiterate. She also confessed that she would welcome a literacy class, but that she cannot draw those individuals into the school in a number that would be supported by the District for funding such a class. Why do you think so little is being done for the functionally illiterate in Salinas?
14. During the last twenty minutes, has your definition or perception of functional literacy altered?
15. Is there anything you have said during this interview that you would not want publicized?

APPENDIX E

Questionnaire Response Sheet

Interview Response

for _____ whose purpose it is to _____

_____ represented by _____ on _____ at _____

1. A person is functionally literate when he

2.

3. a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.
   f.
   g.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11. a.
    b.
    c.
    d.
    e.
    f.

12.

13.

14.

15.

APPENDIX F

1970 Map of Salinas Census Tracts with Location of Adult School Classes

INSET A - SALINAS AND VICINITY

SALINAS PUBLIC LIBRARY
SALINAS CALIFORNIA

1970 Census of Population and Housing
CENSUS TRACTS
SALINAS-MONTEREY, CALIF.
STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA
Final Report PHC(1)-183

2 OF 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS